

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Saturday, December 19, 1987

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

Washington, DC, December 18, 1987.

I hereby designate the Honorable THOMAS S. FOLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on Saturday, December 19, 1987.

JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker of the
House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

At this time of festival and the giving and receiving of gifts we are grateful, O God, for the encouraging words and songs and spirit of the season, even as we remember those whose circumstances do not allow them the joy of these days. May each person find a measure of happiness and hope that is freely given and may all people open their hearts and souls to Your loving and comforting spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

CONGRESSIONAL SOAP OPERA

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is engaged in its regular soap opera, to be continued, to be continued, to be continued. The continuing resolution is nothing more than a grand soap opera.

All the days of our lives were in the floor of the House determining what next to delay. As the world turns, we are stuck in a budget process that needs reform. All the world knows that we need to do something about preventing this kind of delay any longer.

All my children and yours will be stuck the rest of the century and

beyond in a budget process that does not work.

It is time to quit this soap opera and return to sanity in the budget process.

SHAME ON THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(Mr. SENSENBRENNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, in the 1986 election the Democratic Party asked the American people to give them control of both Houses of Congress so that they could deal with the public business with dispatch. Well here we are the Saturday before Christmas and the Democrats, who control both Houses of Congress, have yet to pass an appropriation bill, and their conferees have yet to agree on a continuing resolution to keep the Government operating for the next fiscal year.

Shame on the majority party for keeping us here this day. Shame on the majority party for not knowing what we are going to be doing today or tomorrow. Shame on the majority party for not dealing with the budget crisis, and shame on all of us for not adjourning sine die.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the minority leader or you, Mr. Speaker, if there is any word on what is going to happen for the continuation of today and tomorrow and Monday. If someone would like to respond and let the membership back in their offices patiently waiting to find out what is going to go on here this week, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may recall last evening we did have an exchange between the majority leader and the minority side with respect to today, and it was agreed, of course, we would come in at 10 o'clock, and there would not be any business or rollcalls. Members were free to do whatever they wanted.

We will probably recess for the balance of the day or subject to the call of the Chair, and then we would be ad-

journing later in the day over until Sunday, whereupon we would reconvene at 1 p.m. and hopefully by that time tomorrow afternoon all of the necessary papers for the continuing resolution and the reconciliation bill would be in such order that the House and the Senate could both act, and obviously that is either with or without the President's approval. And of course, there will be that timelag in getting a determination from the President as to whether or not he approves of either one of these. We all know that there is always some uncertainty and anxiety about that. It could very well be that if the President chooses to veto it, then obviously it comes back up here on the Hill, and we will have to strip it back to what he would accept, and hopefully get adjourned by this weekend.

The gentleman is well aware that the continuing resolution expired at midnight last night. We did not think that was all that tragic for this weekend because there is very little that happens on Saturday and Sunday. But of course, if we spill over into Monday, then we have a problem on our hands in shutting down the Government.

Mr. SOLOMON. Is the minority leader saying that things have progressed so far that we will have a bill before us on Sunday?

Mr. MICHEL. As far as I can determine, there has been pretty well agreement on most issues except the two outstanding ones with respect to aid to the Contras and the fairness doctrine. I know that the REA was a problem, but that has apparently been scaled back.

The distinguished majority leader who now is in the chair was quite instrumental last evening in helping to move things off dead center and get agreement among the appropriators there. I have not had the very latest update, but from my understanding progress has been made, and now we are just waiting for those two committees to reconvene, finalize their work one way or another, or at least to scale down to what the President will accept.

Mr. SOLOMON. So the rumor running around the Capitol that we are going to come back here tomorrow and pass a 1-day continuing resolution extension for 1 day is not true? We probably, in your estimation, are going to have a bill to vote on?

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is correct, and of course that was part of the discussion when we had the lead-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ership meeting with the President, and in my judgment it was going to be very difficult to get an extension of the continuing resolution and we ought to be prepared if this thing spills over into Monday that these things would have to take place. The Director of OMB has of course already issued his order to the agencies of the Government that would have to comply with that kind of a situation. I hope it does not come about, but we are flying in a sense by the seat of our pants here, I must confess, but that is not abnormal, other than the fact that we can all have our own objections to the fact that as the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, why the whole year and no resolution until practically Christmas Eve? It is disconcerting.

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to hear that the minority leader with his wonderful voice will not be leading us in Christmas carols on December 24 as we did in 1983, I believe.

Mr. MICHEL. I really cannot say. We do not know that for sure. I am hoping that is not the case. As much as I enjoy singing with the Members, we would hope maybe that would take place sometime tomorrow while we are kind of killing some time for the final little dots and dashes to be put on whatever our work might be.

Mr. SOLOMON. I guess the word to the membership then is that they had better come back to Washington and be prepared to vote on the CR tomorrow?

Mr. MICHEL. We are hoping so.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am more concerned about today than tomorrow because I have learned after 9 years in this body you live 1 day at a time and not make too many advance plans. The information I have is that the CR conference has reached agreement as was outlined by the minority leader. However, it is bogged down over the two points which he mentioned, and there are not any meetings scheduled for today.

The question I have is why keep the House in session, albeit in recess for today when we could give everybody the assurance that we would be out of here, with permission for late filing of a conference report and any necessary resolutions from the Rules Committee? I do not see anybody handling the desk over on the majority side.

Mr. SOLOMON. I wonder if the Speaker might be able to respond.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. To me that might be a way to provide a little more certainty, at least for the next 72 hours as to what the membership can and cannot do, and when we meet at 1

o'clock tomorrow we will cross that bridge when we get to it.

Mr. SOLOMON. I wonder if the majority leader sitting in the chair would respond to that inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In response to the gentleman from New York, it was the Chair's intention to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair with the understanding that the House would not convene before 4 o'clock this afternoon, and only after an hour's notice.

The purpose of today's session was in part to offer opportunities for the filing of reports. The suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow is being considered. For the moment, however, our intention was to place the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3289. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; and

H.J. Res. 255. Joint resolution designating the third week in May 1988 as "National Tourism Week."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 526. An act for the relief of Kumari Rajlakshmi Bals.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1382. An act to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to improve the Federal Energy Management program and for other purposes;

S. 1389. An act to amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act with respect to management requisition, and disposition of real property, reauthorization, and participation of foreign governments; and

S. 1901. An act to designate the Federal Building located at 600 Las Vegas Boulevard in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the "Alan Bible Federal Building."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will stand in recess for one-half hour and the House will resume its sitting in 30 minutes.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 12 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess for 30 minutes.

□ 1041

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the

Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY] at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will stand in recess, to meet at 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 5 p.m.

□ 1702

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COELHO] at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3030) "An act to provide credit assistance to farmers, to strengthen the Farm Credit System, to facilitate the establishment of secondary markets for agricultural loans, and for other purposes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to proceed for 1 minute so I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program as he envisions it.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Republican leader yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it would be our purpose to offer a unanimous-consent request regarding the filing of privileged reports and two conference reports that are the major legislative matters before us, and pending approval for that to move to adjourn until tomorrow at 1 p.m. That would be with the understanding that Members would be able and expected to call the respective cloakrooms and learn of any changing developments or changes of plans between now and then, but that would be our intention.

Mr. MICHEL. Under our previous agreement, if we find that 1 o'clock is far too early to transact any significant business, at that time I suspect the majority would like to make a request that the Chair be given recess authority, and we discussed that earlier on. Rather than having that given prematurely, why this gentleman will be here at that particular hour. I suspect the gentleman from Washington

will be here, and then we will negotiate that hurdle at that moment. I do not anticipate any problem, but I think that is probably the orderly way to do it. As the gentleman suggests, I think we ought to keep our membership advised through our electronic system here of roughly where we are, and maybe in view of the meeting that the Speaker and the majority leader and this gentleman and some others will be holding in the next half hour, maybe after that is concluded, in another couple of hours we can make some more definitive announcement over the system to alert the Members more acutely of where we are or where we might go.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL NOON TOMORROW, SUNDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1987, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS AND FOR MANAGERS TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORTS ON H.R. 3545 AND H.J. RES. 395

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until noon tomorrow to file privileged reports, that any privileged report so filed be considered to have laid over for 1 legislative day, and that the managers on the part of the House may have until noon tomorrow to file conference reports on H.R. 3545 and House Joint Resolution 395.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

LOSING CENTRAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the message of this season is peace and reconciliation. That should be our hope today. Yet the administration seeks to perpetuate war in Central America, because it fears the uncertainty of reform more than the certainly limited presence of corrupt dictatorships, and has less faith in our ideas and ideals than do our own people.

II

The administration has never supported the peace process in Central America. It has never called for or supported reform in Guatemala or Honduras, and has only grudgingly sought to give El Salvador a modest hope of a government that controls its own army, much less one that reforms its own oligarchy. It's true response has been to try and hold onto the dead past of the banana dictator, a past that neither our citizens want nor Central Americans will tolerate.

III

The President threatened today to veto all funding for our Government if the House does

not provide \$9 million to the Contras of Nicaragua.

The tragedy of this situation and the ironic nightmare is that Americans and Nicaraguans, alike see the future as something Nicaraguans must determine. The Contras are the symbol and essence of the past, not the hope of the future. But while—and this is the irony—the Contras are made in the United States of America. They are sustained by the Sandinistas' own grandiose military ambitions. Maybe Ortega needs an outside enemy. Maybe that is why he so clearly feeds the fears that drive Reagan to sustain the Contras and their war. Maybe he, as much as Reagan, is trapped by the past.

IV

But the future is in the realm of ideas. Our people want the same thing Central Americans want—a future of peace and decency, governments that serve and do not enslave, a chance in life. The past of the Somozas and the other dictators denied that. Nicaraguans know they want no return to the past. The Contras represent the threat of such a return, and so they cannot prevail. They have the support of neither Nicaraguans nor our own people.

The Sandinistas right now offer no real hope, but at least they are not Somozas, and to Nicaraguans, that is something to consider. The future, however tenuous, the hope, however slender, is for them—not us, to control.

The hope we have should be in this:

If we support peace, we can demand justice.

If we obtain justice, there will be freedom.

But justice will not be easy to obtain, unless we believe in the power of our own ideas. If we believe in that, we will support reform and justice in the forgotten places of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, and we will forget the Contras and listen to Nicaraguans. Just listen. And then work for what ordinary Central Americans want—peace, reconciliation, and elemental justice.

I offer at this point my special report "Central America: How We Got There, and What We Should Do," sent to over 186,000 of the households in the 20th Congressional District I represent. Also a report from the Washington Post, September 4, 1987.

[A Newsletter From U.S. Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez, 20th District, Texas]

CENTRAL AMERICA: HOW WE GOT THERE, AND WHAT WE SHOULD DO

During the last nine years the United States has spent \$5.3 billion in aid to Central American countries. In addition, vast amounts of money have been invested to build new military bases in the area, principally in Honduras. Most of the aid has gone into two tiny countries: El Salvador, which is in the midst of a brutal, bloody civil war, and Honduras, which serves as a base for United States armed forces and U.S.-sponsored rebels against the government of Nicaragua. Our government is spending more in these impoverished countries than it is in all of vast, strategic and mineral rich sub-Saharan Africa. How did this come about, and what should we really be doing?

SOME QUICK HISTORY

The five countries of Central America put together would fit into Texas. Historically, the United States has virtually ignored the

region. For example, when Henry Kissinger wrote a 1500-page book detailing his life as national security adviser, not a word mentioned Central America.

United States interest in the poor and tiny countries of Central America has almost exclusively centered on the Panama Canal and keeping other great powers out. U.S. history in the 1800's is in great part the story of extending control over North America, and hegemony over South America. To this day, our government's primary interest in Central America is to keep the Panama Canal secure, and to keep the governments of the area docile.

On the way to becoming the dominant power of the western hemisphere, the United States took Florida from Spain in 1818 and at about the same time settled with Britain the northwest boundaries of the Louisiana Purchase. Our government watched with alarm as Latin American colonies of Spain established a tenuous independence, for European powers aimed either to put Spain back in control or take over for themselves. Faced with that threat, President Monroe in 1823 declared the United States would oppose any new European colonies in Latin America. The same year Monroe announced his doctrine, Mexico confirmed Austin's grant in Texas; just 23 years later, Texas and the whole Southwest were part of the United States.

Consolidating control in North America, the United States acquired British and Russian claims in the Oregon country and bought Alaska from the Russian Empire. In Latin America, we prevented European powers from taking over the colonies of the dying Spanish Empire, wrested Cuba from Spain, finagled the establishment of Panama, bought out French rights to build a canal there, and finished the great Panama Canal. European influence in the form of tiny colonies throughout the Caribbean remained, but these withered on the vine and most are now independent countries. With the creation of Panama and the completion of the Panama Canal, our policy in Central America became firm: the United States would dominate the area peacefully if possible, forcefully if necessary.

A CLOSER LOOK AT CENTRAL AMERICA

Crowded and poor, all of Central America would easily fit into Texas.

	Population (million)	Area square miles	Population per square mile	Income per capita
Country:				
Guatemala.....	7.9	42,000	188	1,120
Honduras.....	4.0	43,277	92	670
Nicaragua.....	3.0	45,698	66	900
El Salvador.....	5.2	8,260	630	710
Costa Rica.....	2.4	19,575	122	1,150
Totals.....	22.5	158,810	142	
Texas.....	14.2	266,807	53	9,443

CENTRAL AMERICA'S PRESENT SITUATION CAN BE SUMMED UP THIS WAY

Guatemala: endured 30 years of military dictatorship after a 1954 U.S.-sponsored overthrow of the reform-minded Arbenz government. Though there is an elected president, the armed forces remain very much in control of Guatemala. U.S. military aid, cut off for years because of the murderous brutality of the military, is resuming.

Honduras: serves as the principal U.S. military base in the region and also the sanctuary and training site for U.S.-funded contras fighting against the government of

Nicaragua. U.S. military forces routinely carry out large scale maneuvers there. Honduras has long been notable for its corrupt military rule. Our domination of the country has become heavy-handed enough to be embarrassing to the Honduran government.

Costa Rica: is the only real democracy in the region, and not coincidentally the only Central American country with no significant military force. Some contra forces have been based in Costa Rica, and the country has accepted some U.S. military aid. Costa Rica has worked for years to bring about peace in the region, and President Oscar Arias has just won the Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts.

El Salvador: has since a reformist coup in 1979 received \$2.5 billion in U.S. aid. El Salvador has for decades been ruled by a handful of families. Despite elections, El Salvador remains a country caught between right-wing force and terror opposed by armed guerrillas. At least a fourth of the population has been displaced by the civil war; a half million Salvadorans, one-tenth of the total population, have fled to the United States.

Nicaragua: was for 40 years ruled by the corrupt and brutal Somoza family. The Somozas, installed and supported by the United States, were deposed in a wildly popular 1979 revolution. After the Marxist-minded Sandinista faction won control, the United States immediately set up a counter-revolutionary military group known as the contras. Though Nicaragua's economy has gone downhill, the revolutionary government remains in firm control.

U.S. AID HAS INCREASED TENFOLD SINCE 1979.

	1979	1982	1986	1988
Military aid (millions):				
Guatemala			4.89	7.6
Honduras	2.3	31.3	59.7	81.5
Nicaragua	.01			
El Salvador		82.0	126.8	120.0
Costa Rica		2.6	31.7	2.4
Total	2.28	115.902	222.97	211.4
Economic aid (millions):				
Guatemala	24.4	23.2	104.7	139
Honduras	27.4	86.8	128.1	157
Nicaragua	23.0	7.5		
El Salvador	10.2	222.9	308.9	319
Costa Rica	17.2	53.4	128.5	118
Total	102.1	393.1	670.2	733

Note.—Figures exclude U.S. military operations and classified spending.

WE'VE SPENT \$2.5 BILLION IN EL SALVADOR

El Salvador is not even as big as South Texas, just 160 miles long and 60 miles wide. Yet the United States plans to send \$450 million in aid to El Salvador in the next twelve months. Our government has spent vastly more in this tiny country than anywhere else in Central America, twice as much in El Salvador as in runner-up Honduras. Worldwide, only Israel gets more.

El Salvador has a history of poverty and wretched government. The vast bulk of Salvadoran wealth has for generations been in the hands of a few families, known as "la catorce." At least 40 percent of the rural, peasant population has no land, not even land to sharecrop. Laborers in El Salvador do well to earn \$175 a month; rural farm workers earn \$3 a day, when they can find work.

In 1931, a U.S. Army observer reported that in El Salvador, "There is practically no middle class . . . Thirty or forty families own practically everything in the country." The next year a rebellion led by Farabundo Marti broke out; it lasted less than a month

and Marti was summarily executed. The rebels killed perhaps 100 people, but the Salvadoran Army killed off between 30,000 and 40,000 Indian peasants, a crime Salvadorans refer to as 'la matanza,' the massacre. The general responsible, and who ran the government for the next twelve years said, "It is a greater crime to kill an ant than a man, for when a man dies he becomes reincarnated, while an ant dies forever." That brutal attitude is deeply ingrained in El Salvador's powerful right wing.

The Salvadoran government has many times been denounced for crimes against its own people. Abduction, murder and torture have been routinely used against anyone who called for reform. Archbishop Oscar Romero was murdered in his own cathedral; nuns, teachers, labor organizers, newspaper reporters have been brutalized, terrorized or killed. President Napoleon Duarte himself was in 1972 arrested by the Army and beaten to a pulp, his nose and cheeks smashed. His offense was running against the Army-backed candidate. Nor has much changed; violence, arbitrary arrest and murder remain common.

El Salvador's ruling families have been unwilling to tolerate any kind of democratic movement, let alone economic reform. Anybody or anything threatening their power has been denounced as communist. President Duarte explains the cause of the current rebellion this way:

"Fifty years of lies, fifty years of injustice, fifty years of frustration . . . for fifty years the same people had all the power, all the money, all the jobs, all the education, all the opportunities."

United States efforts toward reform in El Salvador have been fitful. Each year Congress demands and the President promises reforms to clean up pervasive corruption, do something about human rights, and to discourage death squads. Each year, nothing really changes. By now, at least 60,000 Salvadorans have been killed. A quarter of the population has been forced out of their homes, and a tenth of the population has fled to the United States.

The U.S. goal is to democratize and reform El Salvador enough to undercut support for the rebels. At the same time, the aim is to get civilian control of the army and to keep the right wing oligarchs from taking over. Almost the whole effort rests on the shoulders of President Duarte. The CIA invested an overwhelming \$10 million in his 1984 election campaign, wanting a moderate reformer in power. The question is whether Salvadorans see him as independent and working for them, rather than for the United States.

NICARAGUA, AN ENEMY WE MADE OURSELVES

Nicaragua has been an area of special interest because it offers a feasible canal route across the Isthmus. Until very recently, our government occasionally talked of building a sea-level canal across Nicaragua. The United States virtually ran Nicaragua from 1902 until 1925, courtesy of the U.S. Marines. After a brief interval, 2,000 Marines landed again in 1927. They stayed long enough to create, equip and train the Nicaraguan National Guard, whose leader Anastasio Somoza killed the rebellious Augusto Sandino and took control of Nicaragua. The Somozas stayed in power until the revolution of 1979. Through all those years, the Somozas enjoyed the generous support of the United States. By all accounts, the Somozas ran one of the most corrupt, repres-

sive regimes in the world. It could not last forever, and did not.

Nicaragua's 1979 revolution unquestionably enjoyed massive popular support. However, the United States could neither bring itself to support the revolution nor to abandon the Somozas, so the revolution took place largely without Uncle Sam. Once the revolution succeeded, a coalition government took power. By summer 1981, the Sandinista faction dominated and the United States promptly set about getting rid of the Sandinistas by force. President Reagan immediately demanded and Congress secretly provided \$19 million to start a counter-revolution headed up by ex-Somoza henchmen. It would have been hard to find a group Nicaraguans hated more.

Congress had little enthusiasm for the secret project against the Sandinistas. Clearly, few Nicaraguans trusted the United States. After all, our government had helped the detested Somozas for decades. The revolution, Marxist or not, had great popular support. This augured ill for a quick fix like a secret war. On the other hand, the Sandinistas were Marxists, certain to make changes inimical to American economic interests. Too, President Reagan wanted a victory over Marxism and reflexively relied on the old formula of a quick military coup. But Congressional fears proved accurate: a U.S.-backed coup simply could not be pulled off. The counter-revolution became an expensive war of attrition.

When the initial \$19 million secret investment in the counter-revolutionary "contras" failed to produce results, President Reagan upped the ante. Congress came across with another secret \$19 million in 1982, and the next year openly voted \$24 million. All this did was to undermine Nicaraguans who openly opposed the Sandinistas. With the contra aid program thus backfiring, Congress tried to cut its losses. The \$14 million voted for contra aid in 1984 was put in escrow. The next year Congress reversed itself and approved \$27 million in "humanitarian" aid. The Administration promptly ignored all restrictions. By selling arms to Iran, the Administration raised money for contra military equipment. And by refusing to account for what happened to the "humanitarian" aid, the Administration was able to use the funds to help supply arms. Though the contras remained ineffective, the conflict hardened the Sandinistas. Congress in 1986 relented and provided \$100 million in military aid to the contras.

President Reagan now wants to send another \$300 million to the contras. However, the Sandinistas are pursuing a peace settlement. The President seeks to derail any settlement and blame the train wreck on the Sandinistas. His original goal remains intact: get rid of them by force.

Ultimately what happens in Nicaragua is up to Nicaraguans. Somoza's fall and the contra failure proved we can no longer prop up governments or impose revolutions that nobody supports. Since Nicaraguans remember our role in their country during the Somoza years, it would be foolish to think that the U.S.-created contras are a popular movement. The contras aren't a home grown political force and so have no chance of governing Nicaragua even if by some miracle they pulled off a military victory.

WHAT SHOULD WE DO?

Central Americans know all too well the U.S.-backed "free" governments have for decades been anything but free. Our policy of supporting corrupt dictators and ignoring

human misery has fostered bitter anti-American feelings, and I have for years argued that fundamental changes are needed if those feelings are going to be changed.

In Guatemala, we should vigorously support development of a true civilian government. It was a terrible mistake to finance the ouster of the Arbenz government and foster 30 years of bloody military rule. Any United States support of the Guatemalan military ought to depend strictly on its adherence to law, respect for civilian authority and above all, respect for basic human rights.

In Honduras, we must stop underwriting government corruption, encourage the development of civilian government, and replace our expensive military program with economic development projects. Honduras may welcome our easy dollars today, but they will soon see the United States as an occupation force. We should help them develop decent government, build a decent economy, and let them stand on their own feet.

In El Salvador, we should encourage democracy and reform. The Farabundo Marti rebels draw their strength from fifty years worth of desperation, and they aren't afraid to die. But President Duarte can't do much unless our government makes it clear that El Salvador's ruling elite must accept reform and support such basic things as land reform, health facilities and schools.

In Nicaragua, we ought to encourage the forces of democracy and reason. I have always opposed support of the contras. Not only has the contra effort failed to work, it has reinforced Nicaraguan resentment against our constant interference in their affairs. The contras have provided the excuse and opportunity for the government to undercut any and all political opposition, as well as blame their own mistakes on the United States. The contras can't win militarily and couldn't govern if they did.

In Costa Rica, our policy should support the democratic government and genuine leadership provided by President Oscar Arias.

Overall, our expensive and pervasive use of force has undercut whatever moral position our country might ever have claimed in Central America. Taking the high ground, President Oscar Arias of Costa Rica has proposed a plan to end fighting in El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua, to promote a free political process, and to eliminate foreign interference. Following his lead, talks to establish peace are going on in El Salvador, Nicaragua is allowing opposition groups to air their views, and Guatemala is pursuing a peaceful settlement with guerrillas. This astonishing movement has left the United States wholly unprepared; leadership in the area has passed perhaps, decisively, into other hands.

The United States cannot succeed anywhere unless we stick to our own values. It is morally bankrupt and politically blind to support military dictatorships just because it is convenient and easy to do so. Throughout the world, our leadership is meaningless

unless it stands for our own principles of law, decency and liberty. With peace and patience, our influence might grow. With bombs and bullets, we are buying only fear and hatred. In the long run, our choice is between being an army of occupation, or helping Central Americans achieve what we would want for ourselves; decent government and a decent chance in life. A policy that helps Central Americans obtain decent government and a decent opportunity is the only thing that will work in the long run. Equally important, such a policy is the only kind that can win the sustained support of our own people.

HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE TOPIC, 1987-88—WHAT CHANGES ARE NEEDED IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD LATIN AMERICA?

The Library of Congress Congressional Research Service has compiled a 712-page document of bibliographical material on the 1987-88 national debate topic for high schools, "What Changes Are Needed in U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Latin America?" I have supplied copies of the volume for reference at the San Antonio Public Library and all high school libraries within the boundaries of the 20th Congressional District.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 4, 1987]

HONDURAN OFFICIAL SAYS REBELS WOULD BE CURBED

(By Wilson Ring)

TEGUCIGALPA, HONDURAS, September 3.—The Honduran foreign minister today acknowledged the presence of anti-Sandinista rebels in Honduras and said his government would comply with a section of the Guatemala peace accord that would forbid Nicaraguan insurgent operations in Honduras.

But while the rebels, or contras, are being more discreet in their Honduran operations, they show no signs of moving their rear bases out of Honduras.

Speaking at a press conference, Honduran Foreign Minister Carlos Lopez Contreras contradicted his statements of two weeks ago in San Salvador when he flatly denied any contra presence in Honduras.

Today he called it "a reality of life" that the contras use Honduran territory, but he maintained that the rebel presence was not authorized by the Honduran government.

The previous Honduran administration had denied the presence of the rebels, but after President Jose Azcona Hoyo took office the government admitted that the rebels use Honduran territory. However, the current government has emphasized that the contras do so without Honduran authority and that Honduras does not have the resources to police the long border with Nicaragua.

Part of the Guatemala peace accord, signed by the region's five presidents Aug. 7, prohibits governments from allowing their territory to be used by groups attempting to destabilize neighboring countries.

The accord, scheduled to take effect Nov. 7, also calls for the region's governments to allow democratic freedoms, for dialogue be-

tween governments and their opponents and for cease-fires.

Lopez Contreras said that Honduras would permit an international verification commission formed as part of the agreement to inspect Honduran territory and that the verification procedures would be worked out at a meeting scheduled for Sept. 17 and 18 in Managua.

In an effort to lower their profile in Honduras, the rebels have almost finished moving their strategic headquarters from the Las Vegas salient in south-central Honduras to a more remote location on the Honduran side of the Coco River, which forms the border between Honduras and Nicaragua, near San Andres de Bocay, Nicaragua, according to rebel and diplomatic sources.

The same sources say the rebels are in the process of moving their logistical operations from Aguacate in central Honduras to the Swan Islands, a Honduran archipelago in the Caribbean, about 200 miles north of the Honduran mainland.

In a related matter, a meeting of Central American vice presidents scheduled to discuss the formation of a Central American parliament, as called for by the Guatemala accord, was postponed until Sept. 11. A spokesman for Azcona said the postponement was requested by Guatemala because not all representatives of the five countries could attend.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1901. An act to designate the Federal Building located at 600 Las Vegas Boulevard in Las Vegas, NV, as the "Alan Bible Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Sunday, December 20, 1987, at 1 p.m.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3719: Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 3742: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. DE LUCA.
H.R. 3754: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.